DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 511 CS 507 804

AUTHOR Beadle, Mary E.; Perrico, Ralph
TITLE Collaboration among Speech and Writing Teachers: Toward Recognizing Patterns of Methodology.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (76th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052))

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; *Cooperative Learning; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Learning Strategies; Models; *Speech Instruction; *Team Teaching; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Teaching; *Process Approach (Writing)

ABSTRACT

Departmental lines can interfere with collaboration among academic colleagues. Working together within the same department, a speech teacher and a writing teacher realized that both speech and writing have preparatory (planning and development), performance, and evaluation stages, and that within the various stages students use the same or similar techniques. In the two teachers' collaborative course, the initial writing assignment was an essay based upon a writer's personal experience. Students worked collaboratively in groups, and could brainstorm, use code words, free write, or map. Similarly, the first speech that students prepared was based on personal experience, and students brainstormed together. Work on writing and speech assignments was also similar in the other stages. In each step, students developed their ideas following a process model. They were guided through a system involving problem solving, asking questions, listening skills, and collaborative learning. For each assignment, the speaker or writer considered the audience as part of the process of communication. The final products were evaluated by the instructor, peers, and the student alike. The collaboration of the speech and writing instructors served as a model for students and helped the educators focus their own ideas. The instructors concluded that colleagues belong together whenever teaching and learning is the underlying process. (SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346511

COLLABORATION AMONG SPEECH AND WRITING TEACHERS: TOWARD RECOGNIZING PATTERNS OF METHODOLOGY

MARY E. BEADLE and RALPH PERRICO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Beadle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for presentation at the 1990 Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Nov. 1-4, 1990.

CS507804

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

At a time when co-operation and collaborative learning have become buzz words in education, we have discovered that departmental lines frequently interfere with co-operation and collaboration among academic colleagues. Instead of emphasizing similarities between related discipline, we often stress differences, thereby doing ourselves and our students a disservice by fragmenting rather than integrating the educational experience. The tradition of liberal arts education is the inter-relationship of the various subjects. Writing across the curriculum programs have inspired dialogue among the disciplines, but again frequently marking their differences. Perhaps there is an alternative which can help us integrate our work more successfully. Writing teachers and speech teachers reside in different departments on large college campuses, but in small liberal arts colleges often are in the same department. Some teachers teach both writing and speech, and the shift from one subject to the next can be facilitated if the teacher realizes that a similar process underlies both subjects. Within the process itself, there are similar strategies and techniques for teaching. For example, as teachers from different disciplines, we agree that students need to learn to co-operate, to solve problems, and to make decisions, and none of these three items are peculiar to a specific discipline but instead the province of most discipline. Wynne(1983) complains that students in colleges of education "are usually not properly trained in ways to teach co-operation... (497). Meyers(1986) believes that through problem-solving students become committed to their disciplines and involved in their world. And finally, the student who is

able to recognize the connections among the various disciplines and to make intelligent decisions becomes the hallmark of the educated person. Students who learn to speak and to listen well, who acquire the skill to write effectively, who have the ability to work well with others are the successes of the educational system.

Background

Hagaman(1986) reminds us that speech and writing are historically and developmentally closely related. Historically, the practice of relationships between speech and writing began with rhetoricians like Cicereo and Quintillian. This relationship between the practice of speech and writing continued in this country until the eighteenth century. Since the early nineteenth century, a new interest in the study of literature made courses exclusively writing and speech evolved into its own course of study. Since 1914, Speech and English have been separated by different curricula.

Developmentally speech and writing are also related. Kroll(1983) describes "four functional relationships" that change as the student develops: preparation, consolidation, differentiation and integration (94). Mader(1985) suggests that because of the similarity in development that writing and speech courses be paired so that syllabi and assignments can be co-ordinated and the student can use the relationships to develop both speaking and writing skills.

My colleague and I see many relationships in the teaching of Speech and English. After four years of discussion and sharing ideas, we have

discovered that the division between the disciplines is somewhat artificial and through sharing our experience, we hope to demonstrate the similarity in process both in writing and in speech, and to discuss the benefits of collaboration. Both subjects have a planning or preparatory stage, a practice stage, a performance stage and an evaluation stage. And within the various stages, students use the same or similar techniques.

Process: Writing and Speaking

Like our colleagues before us, we define process as a series of actions that bring about a result over the passage of time. Communication is defined as a process in which each of the parts(writer, speaker, message, form, audience, feedback) act and react as a whole. There is a continuous interplay among these parts, shaping and reshaping the communication. The influences include both external forces and the interaction of the parts (Ehninger, Monroe, Gronbeck 1978, 13). Because of on-going process, time is needed to plan and develop communication. Both speech and writing pedagogy can allow students the time necessary to develop the communication in a manner that emphasizes the recursive nature of creating messages.

Writing is a form of both private and public communication, but a similar process is employed in both modes. When broken down into it's various components, writing becomes a more manageable undertaking. The various stages of writing are planning, drafting, publication and evaluation. These stages are recursive, not linear, and the time spent on each stage is limited solely by the pedagogical parameters of the assignment. Since this is so, teachers, if they choose, can adapt the

process to meet the needs of individual students.

Speech is a type of communication and is a process in two ways; in the act itself and in the development of both the speech content and form. It is this latter consideration of process that will be discussed.

Most of the pedagogy of teaching the speech process consider four stages; planning, development, delivery, evaluation(Heun and Heun, 1986; Osborn and Osborn, 1988; Rose, 1985). Within the stages, speakers need to choose a topic, do audience analysis and adaption, develop an outline and visual aids, choose language, present the speech, and receive audience feedback. The use of the term stages imply that as one stage is the complete, the speaker moves on to the next stage. However, when considered as process, the speaker in preparing the speech moves back and forth between the various stages until the day of delivery.

The similarity of the recursive nature of speech and writing is the basis we used for collaboration. By using examples from the first speech assignment, an informative speech, and the first writing assignment, we will give examples of how the process approach to teaching speech and writing is similar. We will use the four stages, planning, development, presentation, and evaluation, to describe the similarities.

The Planning Process - Writing

The first writing assignment is an essay based on the personal experience of the writer. The authors are compelled to look inward to probe their own ideas and values as the basis for a shared communication. To help the students undertake this task we use groups to accustom students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to collaborative work. In the groups the students may brainstorm, use code words(Flower 1989, 112-116), free write, or map(Trimmer 1988, 35-39). Since the group members are obligated to explain their ideas to the other members, they quickly discover their need to focus their topics. They become aware of process involved in making something internal external. In effect, they make the shift from writer oriented stage to the reader oriented stage(Flower 1989, 190-202).

The Planning Process-Speech

The first speech students prepare is a five minute informative speech based on personal experience. The emphasis on personal experience requires students to begin planning by turning inward; to discover ideas from their own experience. To help students focus their ideas, groups are used in the classroom to brainstorm ideas. Usually, students have a difficult time in choosing what to say. By using groups, students help each other to see what is important or interesting to the topic. Students generally are pleased with this approach after some initial hesitation.

Another technique to help stimulate the internal process is the use of key words. For example in class, the teacher will discuss ideas such as hobbies, job experience, pets, unusual experiences. Some textbooks also include this technique(Heun and Heun, 1986).

The Drafting Process-Writing

The shift from internal to external brings the students the recognition of the role audience plays in the writing process. The students become

aware of the fact that they are no longer imaginary, but real people who do not always hold the same values or make the same associations as the writer. For example, students in nursing, discover that the jargon of their profession is not meaningful to the general academic audience, and so they must therefore clarify terms and procedures which they often assume their audiences understand. Several students of nursing have confessed that this process has been beneficial to them in their career as well as in their written assignment.

Also, it is necessary to note here that the drafting process is unique to each individual. Students choose different means of drafting; some write in pencil, some in pen, some prefer the computer, others the typewriter.

The Drafting Process-Speech

Once students have chosen the topic and have begun to focus their ideas, the speech process begins to consider the audience. Again using groups (grouping by major is often very helpful), students bring drafts of their speeches in outline form to discuss. The speaker begins to find a match between what is important and interesting to him/her and what is important or interesting to the audience. To further enhance this match, students do audience analysis. This analysis may include asking questions aloud and taking a hand count or may include a written survey. By sharing ideas with part of the potential audience, students know the audience better. This helps develop self-confidence. Students also begin to realize, that they need to be clear in presenting their ideas; just because

they understand what they are trying to communicate, that doesn't mean anyone else will. Language choice starts to become part of the process. Peer reinforcement at this time is a powerful learning tool.

The Revision Process-Writing

Murray(1988) has informed us all writing is rewriting. And for many of the current teachers of composition this is the most important stage of the process. Zinsser(1985) tells us, "Because the essence of writing is rewriting, I have never thought of rewriting as an unfair burden--extra homework that I didn't deserve. On the contrary, I think it's a privilege to be able to shape my writing until it's as clean and strong as I can make it" (210). Most experts see this stage as two activities; global or local revision or content and copyediting or proofreading.

In the revision stage the students review their drafts with the thought of filling in any gaps and eliminating any extraneous, digressive material. Again, this is facilitated in the groups, when students read their work to their classmates. Since written composition is for the ear as well as the eye, it is essential that students hear as well as see the essays. Next, students offer the reader constructive criticism, and since they cannot see the text, they must focus on content. Then, each member of the group asks two other members to read the essay and indicate in writing any problems that the text presents.

The Revision Process-Speech

Throughout the three weeks of preparing for the first speech, students

revise both content and form. Content revision is achieved through the use of feedback from the groups and from the teacher. Revision of form otherwise known as delivery, is somewhat harder to achieve.

During the first two weeks of class, students give two brief speeches, prepared in class. The first speech is a speech of introduction; the second speech is a description of the speaker's day. These speeches are done for two reasons. Students need to develop a sense of personal time. The informative speech is limited to five minutes and by doing these two in-class speeches, students can begin to develop a sense of time. Also, non-verbal communication, such as eye contact, nervous habits or speaking too softly, are pointed out. This gives students the opportunity to experience criticism in front of the group and also gives students something to work on for delivery. Students choose one or two delivery techniques to work on for the first speech and inform the teacher in writing what delivery techniques they are revising.

Finally, the class period before the informative speech is due, students give an abbreviated version of the informative speech to their groups. This provides an opportunity to build confidence and to revise form and content one more time.

The Evaluation Process-Writing

Finally, we reach the evaluation stage. At this point the teacher must answer two questions: what am I evaluating and what form will my evaluation assume? Since we have established certain criteria during the process itself, it seems that the evaluation should cover four areas, 1)

the breadth and focus of the topic, 2) the accomodation of the audience. 3) the purpose of the writer in composing the essay, and 4) the effectiveness of the rhetorical and grammatical presentation.

This evaluation may take several forms. One, the teacher may choose to write an evaluation of the essay. Some select to comment on the text itself; some decide to use an additional comment sheet; others have students enter the task on computer and respond in the text itself. Personally, I find the latter method extremely effective. (For some reason students object to revision less when it is done on the computer.) Students again have the option of further revision, if time allows.

As is evident, the evaluation process and revision process mutually support each other. The students evaluate their own works; their peers evaluate the works; and the teacher evaluates the works. After each evaluation students can revise their essays.

The Evaluation Process-Speech

Finally, the day arrives and students present their five minute informative speech to the class. Planning, development, and revision now come together to reach the audience. During this stage, speakers receive both written and verbal evaluations from the audience and the teacher. Content rather than form is emphasized since often delivery becomes the focus of student evaluations and what is said is not considered. Written evaluations include focus which includes audience analysis, organization, use of language and delivery. This evaluation provides the audience an opportunity to develop as critical listeners; the speaker receives verbal

feedback from the teacher immediately and personally. The speaker also comments on his speech. The evaluations are then used as a basis to develop form and content for the next speech. Ideally, speakers should give the speech again, but time is a limitation in this procedure.

Summary and Implications

Through the four stages planning, drafting, revision, and evaluation, students in speech and writing classes are developing their ideas following a process model. Students are guided through a system involving problem solving, asking questions, listening skills(Elbow 1973, 101-106), and collaborative learning. Prior to our discussions, we were not aware of the similarities in the teaching of writing and speaking. After our discussions, it became evident that we were involved in the same process. Our first assignments are based on personal experience as the speaker/writer moves from the internal world to the external world. We both use groups in composing and evaluating. Similar strategies for idea generation include the use of key words and brainstorming. The speaker/writer considers the audience as part of the process of communication. The final product is evaluated by the instructor, by peers, and by the person. All of these instructional methods contribute to a students development in decision making, listening, problem solving, and co-operation.

Being in the same department provided the opportunity for collaboration, something that would have been more awkward if we were in separate departments. Our collaboration also was a wonderful model for

students. We worked together and discussed ideas just as the students did. Like our students, we considered the focus of our classes, the emphasis of our lessons, the audience of our commentary, and the evaluation of our process and product. The collaboration has also benefited our other classes and has provided each of us a sounding board for ideas and stimulated us to think of different techniques to use in class. As a speech teacher, I benefitted from the concept of idea generation and now use a variety of ways in class to help students with ideas for speeches. As an English teacher, my colleague benefitted from the ideas of audience analysis and includes more of focus on audience in the writing of papers.

Our experience has also made us realize that colleagues belong together wherever teaching and learning is the underlying process. We need to recognize that we are not alone. As Grumet(1989) notes: "Teaching (can be) experienced as isolated and isolation work. Teachers do not have very much to do with each other" (21). The culture of an institution may encourage teachers to work defensively and alone, but our experience has shown us that talking encourages us to be better teachers and to share ideas about what works. That by sharing mutual concerns, we can become a community of scholars. What is now evident to the both of us is that whether in speaking or in writing, the communication process is the underlying framework of both speech and English and, most importantly, of collaboration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sources Consulted

Elbow, P. 1973. Writing without teachers. London: Oxford University Press.

Ehninger, D., Monroe, A. & Gronbeck, B. 1978. Principles and types of Speech communication, 8th. edition. Dallas: Scott Foresman.

Flower, L. 1989. Problem solving strategies for writing, 3rd edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Grumet, M.R. 1989. Dinner at Abigail's: Nurturing collaboration. NEA Today, 7:20-25.

Hagman, J. A. 1986. "Readiness is all: The importance of speaking and writing connections." Journal of Teaching Writing, 5:187-192.

Heun, L. & Heun, D. 1986. Public speaking, 2nd edition. St. Paul, MN: West.

Jeffery, R. & Peterson, O. 1989. Speech: A basic text, 3rd edition. New York: Harper and Row.

Kroll, B. 1983. Speaking-writing relationships in the growth of writing abilities. In Fforum, edited by P. Stock. Upper Montclair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook.

Mader, D. 1985. Speech: An approach to teaching writing. Journal of Teaching Writing, 4:254-263.

Meyers, C. 1986. Teaching students to think critically: A guide for faculty in all disciplines. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. 1988. Public speaking. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Trimmer, J.F. & McCrimmon, J.M. 1988. Writing with a purpose, 8th edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wynne, E.A. 1983. Teaching about co-operation. Phi Delta Kappa, 64:497-99.

Zinsser, W. 1985. On writing well, 3rd. edition. New York: Harper and Row.